

Meeting Minutes, January 26, 2006

City Center Advisory Commission

CCAC Members Present: Jim Andrews, Carolyn Barkley, Gretchen Buehner, Alexander Craghead (Alternate), Alice Ellis Gaut, Marland Henderson, Mike Marr, Carl Switzer,

CCAC Member Absent: Ralf Hughes (Alternate), Lily Lilly, Suzanne Gallagher, Mike Stevenson, Judy Monroe, Roger Potoff

Others Present: Lisa Olson, S. Carol Long

Staff Present: Phil Nachbar, Sean Farrelly, Gus Duenes

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Mike Marr called the meeting called to order at approximately 6:40 PM

2. Approve Minutes

Minutes from the December 22, 2005 meeting were not approved due to a lack of a quorum at the time it was considered.

3. CIP Prioritization/ FY 06-07 Budget

Phil presented the preliminary prioritization for CIP projects and the key strategic ideas and criteria by which the projects were ranked. Staff explained that the Strategy was to focus improvements where they can stimulate new development which would generate tax funds which could be used to fund future CIP projects in the downtown. Secondary to that, but also important was to assist a Main Street “transition” which is to show small but distinct visual improvements along Main Street as it changes over time. The idea is based on the “Brand Tigard” notion in the TDIP which is to focus attention on the Downtown to create a “brand” or theme that can begin to take place visually. The committee was asked for their recommendations on the rankings.

Gretchen brought up that the intersection of Main/ Tigard/Commercial needed pedestrian safety improvements, like crosswalks and stop signs. Right now it is a dangerous intersection. There was comment that this area was very dark at night, and that streetlights on the pedestrian level were necessary.

Mike Marr indicated that Burnham should be the #1 priority because of its poor condition. He felt that Main Street was not very important at this point. He was upset that the consultant seemed not to be responsive to the Streetscape Committee and seemed to be designing a street that was too wide. Gus indicated that Burnham’s classification as a collector street was driving some of the choices. There was discussion about how much ROW would be necessary.

There was agreement that Burnham should be the first priority of the CIP and that it would create a “statement” for the downtown. Gretchen asked whether the Ash Ave. segment could be tied together with Burnham.

Mike stated that in his opinion the Main St. façade improvements should not be on the priority list. Staff explained that the Facade Improvements Program has been used by other cities as a matching grant program in which 50% of the exterior improvement cost was contributed by the City, and the other 50% matched by a downtown property owner. The program would not use CIP funds though, and as such is not a CIP project. Improvements could be performed on the Street front of the building only and be used for awnings, painting, windows, architecture. It was mentioned by Staff that it was distinct from the Main St. Visual Improvements, which were more temporary visual improvements on Main Street, such as trees, planters, or other more creative ideas.

Alexander stated that these kinds of things have been done before. There was agreement among members that Main St. temporary visual improvements should not be high on the list, except for possibly street trees. Members agreed that Main St. safety improvements were more important.

Mike said that the bigger projects should get priority and should be separated from the smaller budgeted projects. There was a concern that the Burnham St. project wouldn't get underway for 2 years. A member indicated that a sign could be posted indicating what was coming.

The members consented that their top 10 rankings of project priorities were:

1. Burnham St. (Main to Hall)
2. Ash Ave. (Burnham to Rail)
3. Main St/Commercial St/ Tigard St. intersection pedestrian safety improvements
4. Commuter Rail Enhancements
5. Commercial St. at Main St. Intersection)
6. Commercial St. (Main to Lincoln)
7. Fanno Creek Public Area Land Acquisition
8. Fanno Creek Trail/ Park Restoration (Hall to Main)
9. Main St. street trees
10. Fanno Creek Trail Expansion (Main to Grant)

Phil next discussed Fiscal Year 06-07 Budget and asked for their input. There was discussion about the high costs that were listed for Main Street Streetscape. Staff indicated that although full streetscape improvements were not a priority for Main St at this time, the list represents all of projects that are being considered and could potentially be funded in the future.

The committee indicated they were not prepared to make specific recommendations because they needed more information about how the budget fit into the overall city budget.

4. Hall Blvd./99 W Design Modification

Phil updated the Committee on the progress on designing the gateway at Hall/99 W. Gretchen commented that it seemed that 3 different citizen committees were working on this, and a question about who would have the final input into the City's recommendation to Wash Co/ ODOT.

Mike raised a concern that OTAK was not responsive to the concerns of the Streetscape committee and asked whether their input would come at the beginning or the end of the process. Other committee members agreed with this. Phil indicated that there was a need to get in synch with Wash Co.'s schedule on redoing the intersection and that the consultants should get input from the Streetscape working group, but also use their expertise in designing the intersection. The Streetscape Committee. should take the lead on this with the CCAC reviewing the design.

Gretchen commented that perhaps a subgroup of the CCAC should meet with OTAK for an information session. Lisa, as a citizen, suggested that the streetscape process might have too many committees involved. Gretchen stated there was a need to get a cohesive lobby to get on the same wavelength. It was pointed out there was overlap on membership between the CCAC and Streetscape Committee. Gretchen suggested that a representative, perhaps some one with a transportation background like Carl or herself, could be a liaison to the Streetscape Committee. from the CCAC and could look at initial concepts of the gateway.

5. Commuter Rail Update

Phil updated the status, that the City Council had endorsed the original shelter design. He had looked into the costs of the Tualatin station and found that it was costing more than first thought around \$485,000. TriMet was not picking up the additional costs for the enhanced Tualatin station design. Mike asked whether Tigard could get a bid for construction from a local contractor to reduce costs and make more money available for improved design. Phil said that he had asked TriMet about this and that they would not consent to a local bid – they want control over the construction and schedule.

6. Urban Renewal Video

Phil updated the status of the video and it should be completed by Tualatin Valley TV by March. It would be cleared by the City's attorneys to ensure it did not have an advocacy message. A committee member asked whether a shorter version- perhaps 2-3 minutes of highlights could be produced that could be played at public events. The longer version could be used by the committee for more formal presentations. Staff indicated that the suggestion would be passed on to the TV Cable TV.

7. Other Business/Announcements

The next meeting of the CCAC is scheduled for Thursday, February 26, 2006 at the Town Hall Meeting Room of the Civic Center.